



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,172	12/13/2001	William G. Miller	US010067	3915
24737	7590	06/21/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			DESIR, JEAN WICEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2614	6	
DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/022,172	MILLER, WILLIAM G. 
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jean W. Désir	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/29/02, Pre-Amendment.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2_4.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because Fig. 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-7, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Griepentrog (US 6,614,482).

Claim 1:

Griepentrog discloses:

A control circuit (Fig. 2) for use in a video processor which combines automatic kinescope bias (AKB) control (items 28, 30 of Fig.2), and average individual beam current (item 103 of Fig. 2) sensing and limiting in at least one CRT, comprising:

automatic kinescope bias (AKB) control circuitry for detecting (Fig. 2 items 20, 30) a magnitude of individual red (R), green (G) and blue (B) cathode currents driving corresponding R, G and B CRTs, generating R, G and B average cathode current control signals (col. 3 lines 16-44) therefrom, and using the R, G and B average cathode current control signals as feedback (Fig. 2 item 103) to the video processor to attenuate the R, G and B cathode currents approximately equal amounts; and

selective beam current limiting circuitry (col. 3 lines 16-19) which compares at least one of the R, G and B average current control signals with a predetermined signal, and whereupon the at least one of the R, G and B average current control signals exceeds the predetermined signal (col. 1 lines 47-61), introducing a gain reduction in corresponding video gain stages within the video processor (items 103, 204, 20) to limit said at least one of the R, G and B average current control signals.

Claim 2 is inherent to Griepentrog's disclosure.

Claim 3 is disclosed, see Fig. 20, 103, col. 3 lines 57-59.

Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 5:

Griepentrog discloses:

An automatic kinescope bias (AKB) control signal for use in a projection television system (Fig. 2) which includes at least two (B, G, R) separate cathode ray tubes (CRTs) and a video processing control circuit with circuitry for combined (items 20, 30) automatic kinescope bias (AKB) control, and circuitry (103) for sensing and limiting an average individual cathode beam current in the at least two separate CRTs, said AKB signal generated by steps including:

sampling an average cathode beam current (Fig. 2 item 103) provided to each of the at least two CRTs and generating a corresponding cathode current level (Fig. 2 items 20, 22, 24) signal by said sampling;

and utilizing each generated cathode current level (Fig. 2 items 20, 22, 24) signal to determine an average CRT cathode beam current driving an electron gun in the corresponding CRT, and generating an automatic kinescope bias (Fig. 2 items 20, 30) control signal in accordance with a magnitude of said average cathode beam current (Fig. 2 item 103) for use as a feedback signal for at least one of: automatic CRT cut-off stabilization and selective beam limiting (col. 3 lines 16-19).

Claim 6:

Griepentrog discloses:

A video control circuit (Fig. 2) for carrying out an automatic kinescope bias control (items 20, 30), and an average individual beam current (item 103, 204) sensing and limiting in respective cathode ray tubs (20, 22, 24), the video control circuit comprising:

a video processor (item 204); and

a feedback circuit (30, 204, 103, 204) for feeding back proportions of red, green and blue cathode currents driving the corresponding cathode ray tubs to the video processor (204) for automatic kinescope bias control by adjusting black levels (col. 3 lines 30-44) of the respective cathode currents (R, G, B), the feedback circuit comprising at least one average beam current sensing circuit (103) for sensing the proportion of one of the cathode currents (R, G, B), to feed back a beam limiting signal to the video processor (204) for introducing a gain reduction in video gain stages to limit the red, green and blue cathode currents in case the proportion of one of the cathode currents (R, G, B) exceeds a predetermined value (col. 3 lines 16-19, col. 1 lines 47-61).

Claim 7 is disclosed, see col. 1 lines 49-61, col. 2 lines 57-64, col. 3 lines 16-44.

Claim 12 is disclosed, see col. 4 lines 21-24.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 8-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (703) 308 9571. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (703) 305 4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD
Jun. 7, 04

MICHAEL H. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER